

**UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
DISTRICT OF MINNESOTA**

Case No. 0:17-1884-PAM-HB

In re EpiPen ERISA Litigation,

JOINT MOTION REGARDING CONTINUED SEALING

Pursuant to Local Rule 5.6(c), documents were filed under temporary seal in connection with the following motions:

- Defendants CVS Health Corp., CaremarkPCS Health L.L.C., Caremark, L.L.C., and Caremark Rx, L.L.C.’s Motion to Dismiss [Dkt. 209];
- Defendants Express Scripts Holding Co., Express Scripts, Inc., and Medco Health Solutions, Inc.’s Motion to Dismiss [Dkt. 210];
- Defendants Optum, Inc., OptumRx Holdings, LLC, OptumRx, Inc., United HealthCare Services, Inc. and UnitedHealth Group Inc.’s Motion to Dismiss [Dkt. 211]; and
- Defendant Prime Therapeutics LLC’s Motion to Dismiss [Dkt. 212].

Pursuant to Local Rule 5.6(d), the parties submit this Joint Motion Regarding Continued Sealing.

Dkt. No.	Description of Document	Mark "X" in Applicable Column			Nonparty That Designated Doc. Confidential (If Any)	Reason Why Document Should Remain Sealed or Be Unsealed
		Parties Agree Doc. Should Remain Sealed	Parties Agree Doc. Should Be Unsealed	Parties Disagree		
214	Unredacted copy of Defendants' Combined Memorandum of Law in Support of Their Motions to Dismiss the Consolidated Class Action Complaint	X				<p>A redacted copy of this brief was filed at Dkt. 215.</p> <p>Defendants assert that redacted portions of the brief contain citations to limited excerpts of non-public, highly competitive, proprietary and/or commercially sensitive contractual terms contained in Defendants' business contracts that have been marked Highly Confidential pursuant to the Protective Order [Dkt. 249]. In addition, the underlying documents which are cited were designated as confidential under a non-disclosure agreement between the contracting partners.</p> <p>Because Defendants are the designating parties, Plaintiffs</p>

					take no position on whether this document should remain under seal pursuant to Rule 5.6.
217	Excerpts of Pharmacy Benefit Management Agreement between Prime Therapeutics LLC (“Prime”) and Horizon Healthcare Services, Inc. (“Horizon”), dated November 2012 (Ex. A to O’Hara Decl.)	X			<p>Defendant Prime Therapeutics LLC (“Prime”) asserts that excerpts of this document contain non-public, highly competitive, proprietary and/or commercially sensitive contractual terms. In addition, the terms of this agreement were designated as confidential under a non-disclosure agreement between the contracting partners. This document has been marked as Highly Confidential pursuant to the Protective Order [Dkt. 249]. Finally, this document has no relevance to the pending Motions to Dismiss given Ms. Paschalidis’ voluntary dismissal [Dkt. 247], and should remain sealed pursuant to Magistrate Judge Rau’s April 2 Order [Dkt. 195].</p> <p>Because Prime is the designating party, Plaintiffs take no position on whether this</p>

					document should remain under seal pursuant to Rule 5.6.
218	Excerpts of Pharmacy Benefit Management Agreement between Prime and Blue Cross and Blue Shield of Florida, Inc. (“Florida Blue”), entered into as of January 1, 2013 (Ex. B to O’Hara Decl.)	X			<p>Prime asserts that excerpts of this document contain non-public, highly competitive, proprietary and/or commercially sensitive contractual terms. In addition, the terms of this agreement were designated as confidential under a non-disclosure agreement between the contracting partners. This document has been marked as Highly Confidential pursuant to the Protective Order [Dkt. 249].</p> <p>Because Prime is the designating party, Plaintiffs take no position on whether this document should remain under seal pursuant to Rule 5.6.</p>
219	Excerpts of Pharmacy Benefit Management Agreement between Prime and Florida Blue, entered into as of January 1, 2016 (Ex. C to O’Hara Decl.)	X			<p>Prime asserts that excerpts of this document contain non-public, highly competitive, proprietary and/or commercially sensitive contractual terms. In addition, the terms of this agreement were designated as confidential under a non-disclosure agreement between</p>

					<p>the contracting partners. This document has been marked as Highly Confidential pursuant to the Protective Order [Dkt. 249].</p> <p>Because Prime is the designating party, Plaintiffs take no position on whether this document should remain under seal pursuant to Rule 5.6.</p>
226	Unredacted Declaration of Hillary Timmons-Tejeda	X			<p>A redacted copy of this declaration was filed at Dkt. 227.</p> <p>Prime asserts that redacted portions of this declaration contain references to HIPAA Protected Health Information of now-dismissed Named Plaintiff Arissa Paschalidis. <i>See</i> 45 C.F.R. § 160.103. In addition, this document has no relevance to the pending Motions to Dismiss given Ms. Paschalidis' voluntary dismissal [Dkt. 247], and should remain sealed for the same reasons set forth in Magistrate Judge Rau's April 2 Order [Dkt. 195].</p>

					Because Prime is the designating party, Plaintiffs take no position on whether this document should remain under seal pursuant to Rule 5.6.
228	Report of all prescription drug purchases shown in Prime's Records for (now-dismissed) Named Plaintiff Arissa Paschalidis (Ex. A to Timmons-Tejada Decl.)	X			<p>Prime asserts that this document contains HIPAA Protected Health Information of now-dismissed Named Plaintiff Arissa Paschalidis. <i>See</i> 45 C.F.R. § 160.103. In addition, this document has no relevance to the pending Motions to Dismiss given Ms. Paschalidis' voluntary dismissal [Dkt. 247], and should remain sealed for the same reasons set forth in Magistrate Judge Rau's April 2 Order [Dkt. 195].</p> <p>Because Prime is the designating party, Plaintiffs take no position on whether this document should remain under seal pursuant to Rule 5.6.</p>
229	Report of (now-dismissed) Named Plaintiff Arissa Paschalidis insurance coverage	X			Prime asserts that this document contains HIPAA Protected Health Information of now-dismissed Named Plaintiff Arissa Paschalidis. <i>See</i> 45

	(Ex. B to Timmons-Tejada Decl.)				C.F.R. § 160.103. In addition, this document has no relevance to the pending Motions to Dismiss given Ms. Paschalidis' voluntary dismissal [Dkt. 247], and should remain sealed for the same reasons set forth in Magistrate Judge Rau's April 2 Order [Dkt. 195]. Because Prime is the designating party, Plaintiffs take no position on whether this document should remain under seal pursuant to Rule 5.6.
232	Excerpts of Participating Group Services Agreement between CaremarkPCS Health, L.L.C. and U.S. Bancorp, entered into as of January 1, 2015 (Ex. 1 to Oesterle Decl.)	X			Defendant CaremarkPCS Health, L.L.C. ("CaremarkPCS Health") asserts that the excerpted document contains the non-public, highly competitive, and proprietary business information of CVS and/or its subsidiaries, and the terms of agreements designated as confidential under non-disclosure agreements between U.S. Bancorp and a subsidiary of CVS. This document has been designated as Highly Confidential pursuant to the Protective Order [Dkt. 249].

					Because CaremarkPCS Health is the designating party, Plaintiffs take no position on whether this document should remain under seal pursuant to Rule 5.6.
233	Amended and Restated Pharmacy Benefit Management Subcontract Agreement by and between Aetna Health Management, LLC and CaremarkPCS Health, L.L.C., dated as of October 2, 2013 (Ex. 2 to Oesterle Decl.)	X			<p>CaremarkPCS Health asserts that the excerpted document contains the non-public, highly competitive, and proprietary business information of CVS and/or its subsidiaries, and the terms of agreements designated as confidential under non-disclosure agreements between Aetna Health Management and a subsidiary of CVS. This document has been designated as Highly Confidential pursuant to the Protective Order [Dkt. 249].</p> <p>Because CaremarkPCS Health is the designating party, Plaintiffs take no position on whether this document should remain under seal pursuant to Rule 5.6.</p>

236	Excerpts of the Integrated Prescription Drug Program Master Agreement entered into on January 1, 2009 by U.S. Bancorp and Medco Health Solutions, Inc. (Ex. A to Hart Decl.)	X				Defendant Medco Health Solutions, Inc. (“Medco”) asserts that excerpts of this document contain non-public, highly competitive, proprietary and/or commercially sensitive contractual terms. Additionally, U.S. Bancorp and Medco Health Solutions, Inc. agreed to keep the terms of this agreement confidential. This document has been marked as Highly Confidential pursuant to the Protective Order [Dkt. 249]. Because Medco is the designating party, Plaintiffs take no position on whether this document should remain under seal pursuant to Rule 5.6.
237	Excerpts of the Amendment to the Integrated Prescription Drug Program Master Agreement entered into on January 1, 2011 by U.S. Bancorp and Medco Health Solutions, Inc. (Ex. B to Hart Decl.)	X				Medco asserts that excerpts of this document contain non-public, highly competitive, proprietary and/or commercially sensitive contractual terms. Additionally, U.S. Bancorp and Medco Health Solutions, Inc. agreed to keep the terms of this agreement confidential. This document has been marked as

					Highly Confidential pursuant to the Protective Order [Dkt. 249]. Because Medco is the designating party, Plaintiffs take no position on whether this document should remain under seal pursuant to Rule 5.6.
238	Excerpts of an amendment to the Integrated Prescription Drug Program Master Agreement entered into on February 4, 2013 by U.S. Bancorp and Medco Health Solutions, Inc. (Ex. C to Hart Decl.)	X			Medco asserts that excerpts of this document contain non-public, highly competitive, proprietary and/or commercially sensitive contractual terms. Additionally, U.S. Bancorp and Medco Health Solutions, Inc. agreed to keep the terms of this agreement confidential. This document has been marked as Highly Confidential pursuant to the Protective Order [Dkt. 249]. Because Medco is the designating party, Plaintiffs take no position on whether this document should remain under seal pursuant to Rule 5.6.
239	Excerpts of the Prescription Drug Program Agreement	X			Defendant Express Scripts Inc. ("ESI") asserts that excerpts of this document contain non-

	entered into on January 1, 2017 by U.S. Bancorp and Express Scripts Inc. (Ex. D to Hart Decl.)					public, highly competitive, proprietary and/or commercially sensitive contractual terms. Additionally, U.S. Bancorp and ESI agreed to keep the terms of this agreement confidential. This document has been marked as Highly Confidential pursuant to the Protective Order [Dkt. 249]. Because ESI is the designating party, Plaintiffs take no position on whether this document should remain under seal pursuant to Rule 5.6.
242	Excerpts of the Agreement for Health Care Plan Services entered into on January 1, 2001 (as amended and restated January 1, 2004) between Delta Air Lines, Inc., Delta Benefits Management, Inc., the Delta Family-Care Medical Plan, the Delta Pilots Medical Plan and United Healthcare Insurance Company.	X				Defendant UnitedHealthcare Services, Inc. asserts that excerpts of this document contain non-public, highly competitive, proprietary and/or commercially sensitive contractual terms. In addition, the contracting parties agreed to keep the terms of this agreement confidential. This document has been marked as Highly Confidential pursuant to the Protective Order [Dkt. 249].

	(Ex. A to Nguyen Decl.)				Because UnitedHealthcare Services, Inc. is the designating party, Plaintiffs take no position on whether this document should remain under seal pursuant to Rule 5.6.
243	Excerpts of the Sixth Amendment to the Agreement For Health Care Plan Services (as amended and restated January 1, 2004) made by and between United HealthCare Insurance Company and Delta Air Lines, Inc., Delta Benefits Management, Inc., Delta Family-Care Medical Plan, Delta Account-Based Healthcare Plan, and Delta Pilots Medical Plan (Ex. B to Nguyen Decl.)	X			<p>United HealthCare Services, Inc. asserts that excerpts of this document contain non-public, highly competitive, proprietary and/or commercially sensitive contractual terms. In addition, the contracting parties agreed to keep the terms of this agreement confidential. This document has been marked as Highly Confidential pursuant to the Protective Order [Dkt. 249].</p> <p>Because United HealthCare Services, Inc. is the designating party, Plaintiffs take no position on whether this document should remain under seal pursuant to Rule 5.6.</p>
244	Excerpts of the Twelfth Amendment to the Agreement For Health Care Plan Services (as	X			United HealthCare Services, Inc. asserts that excerpts of this document contain non-public, highly competitive, proprietary

	amended and restated January 1, 2004) made by and between United HealthCare Services, Inc. and Medica Self-Insured and Delta Air Lines, Inc., Delta Family-Care Medical Plan, Delta Account-Based Healthcare Plan, Northwest Healthcare Plan and Delta Pilots Medical Plan. (Ex. C to Nguyen Decl.)				and/or commercially sensitive contractual terms. In addition, the contracting parties agreed to keep the terms of this agreement confidential. This document has been marked as Highly Confidential pursuant to the Protective Order [Dkt. 249]. Because United HealthCare Services, Inc. is the designating party, Plaintiffs take no position on whether this document should remain under seal pursuant to Rule 5.6.
245	Excerpts of the Prescription Drug Benefit Administration Agreement entered into on January 1, 2013 by and between United HealthCare Services, Inc. and OptumRx, Inc. (Ex. D to Nguyen Decl.)	X			United HealthCare Services, Inc. and OptumRx, Inc. assert that excerpts of this document contain non-public, highly competitive, proprietary and/or commercially sensitive contractual terms. In addition, the contracting parties agreed to keep the terms of this agreement confidential. This document has been marked as Highly Confidential pursuant to the Protective Order [Dkt. 249].

					Because United HealthCare Services, Inc. and OptumRx are the designating parties, Plaintiffs take no position on whether this document should remain under seal pursuant to Rule 5.6.
246	Excerpts of the Second Amendment to the Prescription Drug Benefit Administration Agreement entered into on September 1, 2015, by and between OptumRx, Inc. f/k/a RxSolutions, Inc., d/b/a Prescriptions Solutions, and United HealthCare Services, Inc. (Ex. E to Nguyen Decl.)	X			<p>United HealthCare Services, Inc. and OptumRx, Inc. assert that excerpts of this document contain non-public, highly competitive, proprietary and/or commercially sensitive contractual terms. In addition, the contracting parties agreed to keep the terms of this agreement confidential. This document has been marked as Highly Confidential pursuant to the Protective Order [Dkt. 249].</p> <p>Because United HealthCare Services, Inc. and OptumRx are the designating parties, Plaintiffs take no position on whether this document should remain under seal pursuant to Rule 5.6.</p>

258	Unredacted copy of Plaintiffs' Memorandum of Law in Opposition to Defendants' Motions to Dismiss	X				<p>A redacted copy of this brief was filed at Dkt. 259.</p> <p>Defendants assert that redacted portions of this brief contain citations to non-public, highly competitive, proprietary and/or commercially sensitive contractual terms contained in Defendants' business contracts that have been marked Highly Confidential pursuant to the Protective Order [Dkt. 249]. In addition, the underlying documents which are cited were designated as confidential under a non-disclosure agreement between the contracting partners.</p> <p>Because Defendants are the designating parties, Plaintiffs take no position on whether this document should remain under seal pursuant to Rule 5.6.</p>
262	Pharmacy Benefit Management Agreement between Prime and Blue Cross and Blue Shield of Florida, Inc. ("Florida	X				Plaintiffs filed this document in its entirety in support of their opposition to Defendants' motion to dismiss.

	Blue"), entered into as of January 1, 2013 (Ex. 1 to Obrist Decl.)				Prime asserts that in order to protect its confidential information, either (a) the entire document should remain under seal or (b) Plaintiffs should file under seal a version of the document that only includes excerpts of the information that Plaintiffs cited in their opposition. This position is supported on multiple grounds, including but not limited to the fact that the document contains non-public, highly competitive, proprietary and/or commercially sensitive contractual terms, including pricing terms and ancillary terms affecting prices, and terms revealing the proprietary packaging of certain services, which are non-public, and specific and confidential to the contracting partners, all of which are not relevant to Plaintiffs' citation [Dkt. 258 at 64, fn. 41]; because the contract is designated as confidential under a non-disclosure agreement between the contracting parties; and because
--	--	--	--	--	--

					<p>specifically with respect to subpart (b), although Magistrate Judge Rau's April 2 Order directed that the "filer" must "limit the amount of sealed material" [Dkt. 195 at 5], Plaintiffs filed the entire 63-page contract while only citing two definitional sentences.</p> <p>Because Prime is the designating party, Plaintiffs take no position on whether this document should remain under seal pursuant to Rule 5.6. If the Court finds sealing is appropriate under Rule 5.6, Plaintiffs agree with Prime, as outlined in subpart (a) above, that the document should remain under seal in its entirety. Plaintiffs do not agree to the approach outlined by Prime in subpart (b); it is inappropriate for Prime to substantively alter Plaintiffs' motion to dismiss response through a Rule 5.6 filing. Plaintiffs do not agree with Prime's relevance claims above, and as explained in</p>
--	--	--	--	--	---

					Plaintiffs' MTD Opposition brief (ECF No. 258), submission of mere excerpts of contracts is inappropriate and misleading because neither the Court nor the parties can understand excerpts without their full context. If the Court does not seal the entire document as submitted as outlined in subpart (a) above, then Plaintiffs propose the alternative of publicly filing a redacted full version that redacts everything not cited or relied upon in the MTD briefing.
263	Pharmacy Benefit Management Agreement between Prime and Florida Blue, entered into as of January 1, 2016 (Ex. 2 to Obrist Decl.)	X			<p>Plaintiffs filed this document in its entirety in support of their opposition to Defendants' motion to dismiss.</p> <p>Prime asserts that in order to protect its confidential information, either (a) the entire document should remain under seal or (b) Plaintiffs should file under seal a version of the document that only includes excerpts of the</p>

					information that Plaintiffs cited in their opposition. This position is supported on multiple grounds, including but not limited to the fact that the document contains non-public, highly competitive, proprietary and/or commercially sensitive contractual terms, including pricing terms and ancillary terms affecting prices, and terms revealing the proprietary packaging of certain services, which are non-public, and specific and confidential to the contracting partners, all of which are not relevant to Plaintiffs' citation [Dkt. 258 at 64, fn. 41]; because the contract is designated as confidential under a non-disclosure agreement between the contracting parties; and because specifically with respect to subpart (b), although Magistrate Judge Rau's April 2 Order directed that the "filer" must "limit the amount of sealed material" [Dkt. 195 at 5], Plaintiffs filed the entire 73-
--	--	--	--	--	---

					<p>page contract while only citing two definitional sentences.</p> <p>Because Prime is the designating party, Plaintiffs take no position on whether this document should remain under seal pursuant to Rule 5.6. If the Court finds sealing is appropriate under Rule 5.6, Plaintiffs agree with Prime, as outlined in subpart (a) above, that the document should remain under seal in its entirety. Plaintiffs do not agree to the approach outlined by Prime in subpart (b); it is inappropriate for Prime to substantively alter Plaintiffs' motion to dismiss response through a Rule 5.6 filing. Plaintiffs do not agree with Prime's relevance claims above, and as explained in Plaintiffs' MTD Opposition brief (ECF No. 258), submission of mere excerpts of contracts is inappropriate and misleading because neither the Court nor the parties can understand excerpts without</p>
--	--	--	--	--	---

						their full context. If the Court does not seal the entire document as submitted as outlined in subpart (a) above, then Plaintiffs propose the alternative of publicly filing a redacted full version that redacts everything not cited or relied upon in the MTD briefing.
269	Unredacted copy of Defendants' Combined Reply in Support of Their Motions to Dismiss	X				<p>A redacted copy of this brief was filed at Dkt. 270.</p> <p>Defendants assert that redacted portions of the brief contain citations to limited excerpts of highly sensitive, proprietary business information contained in Defendants' documents that have been marked Highly Confidential pursuant to the Protective Order [Dkt. 249]. In addition, the underlying documents which are cited were designated as confidential under a non-disclosure agreement between the contracting partners.</p>

						Because Defendants are the designating parties, Plaintiffs take no position on whether this document should remain under seal pursuant to Rule 5.6.
--	--	--	--	--	--	---

[Remainder of this page intentionally left blank]

Dated: September 20, 2018

LOCKRIDGE GRINDAL
NAUEN P.L.L.P.

By: /s Kate M. Baxter-Kauf
Karen Hanson Riebel, #219770
David W. Asp, #344850
Kate M. Baxter-Kauf, #0392037
Arielle S. Wagner, #0398332
100 Washington Avenue South
Minneapolis, MN 55401
Telephone: (612) 339-6900
Facsimile: (612) 339-0981
khriebel@locklaw.com
dwasp@locklaw.com
kmbaxter-kauf@locklaw.com
aswagner@locklaw.com

Attorneys for Plaintiffs

BERMAN TABACCO

Kathleen M. Donovan-Maher (*pro hac vice*)
Patrick T. Egan (*pro hac vice*)
Justin N. Saif (*pro hac vice*)
Steven L. Groopman (*pro hac vice*)
Marc J. Greenspon (*pro hac vice*)
One Liberty Square, 8th Floor
Boston, MA 02109
Telephone: (617) 542-8300
Facsimile: (617) 542-1194
kdonovanmaher@bermantabacco.com
pegan@bermantabacco.com
jsaif@bermantabacco.com
sgoopman@bermantabacco.com
mgreenspon@bermantabacco.com

BERMAN TABACCO

Christopher Heffelfinger (*pro hac vice*)
44 Montgomery Street, Suite 650
San Francisco, CA 94104
Telephone: (415) 433-3200
cheffelfinger@bermantabacco.com

THE MAUL FIRM, P.C.

Anthony F. Maul (*pro hac vice*)
68 Jay Street, Suite 201
Brooklyn, NY 11201
Telephone: (781) 395-4918
afmaul@maulfirm.com

Attorneys for Plaintiffs Elan and Adam Klein, Leah Weaver, and Susan Illis

ZIMMERMAN REED LLP

Charles Zimmerman, #0120054
Carolyn Anderson, #0275712
1100 IDS Center
80 South 8th Street
Minneapolis, MN 55402
Telephone: (612) 341-0400
Facsimile: (612) 641-0844
charles.zimmerman@zimmreed.com
carolyn.anderson@zimmreed.com

REX SHARP, P.A.

Rex A. Sharp (*pro hac vice*)
Ryan C. Hudson (*pro hac vice*)
Scott B. Goodger (*pro hac vice*)
5301 W. 75th Street
Prairie Village, KS 66209
Telephone: (913) 901-0505
Facsimile: (913) 901-0419
rsharp@midwest-law.com
rhudson@midwest-law.com
sgoodger@midwest-law.com

**ROBBINS GELLER RUDMAN
& DOWD LLP**

Paul J. Geller (*pro hac vice*)
Stuart A. Davidson (*pro hac vice*)
120 East Palmetto Park Road, Suite 500
Boca Raton, FL 33432
Telephone: (561) 750-3000
Facsimile: (561) 750-3364
pgeller@rgrdlaw.com
sdavidson@rgrdlaw.com

**ROBBINS GELLER RUDMAN
& DOWD LLP**

Arthur L. Shingler, III (*pro hac vice*)
Brian O. O'Mara (*pro hac vice*)
655 West Broadway, Suite 1900
San Diego, CA 92101
Telephone: (619) 231-1058
Facsimile: (619) 231-7423
ashingler@rgrdlaw.com
bomara@rgrdlaw.com

KELLER ROHRBACK, L.L.P.

Matthew Gerend (*pro hac vice*)
Lynn Lincoln Sarko (*pro hac vice*)
Gretchen Freeman Cappio (*pro hac vice*)
Gretchen S. Obrist (*pro hac vice*)
Cari C. Laufenberg (*pro hac vice*)
1201 Third Avenue, Suite 3200
Seattle, WA 98101
Telephone: (206) 623-1900
Facsimile: (206) 623-3384
mgerend@kellerrohrback.com
lsarko@kellerrohrback.com
gcappio@kellerrohrback.com
gobrist@kellerrohrback.com
claufenberg@kellerrohrback.com

THE LANIER LAW FIRM

W. Mark Lanier (*pro hac vice*)
Regan E. Bradford (*pro hac vice*)
6810 FM 1960 West
Houston, TX 77069
Telephone: (713) 659-5200
wml@lanierlawfirm.com
reagan.bradford@lanierlawfirm.com

THE LANIER LAW FIRM

Cristina Delise (*pro hac vice*)
Tower 56
126 East 56th Street, 6th Floor
New York, NY 10022
Telephone: (212) 421-2800
cristina.delise@lanierlawfirm.com

BURNS CHAREST LLP

Warren T. Burns (*pro hac vice*)
500 North Akard, Suite 2810
Dallas, TX 75201
Telephone: (469) 904-4550
Facsimile: (469) 444-5002
wburns@burnscharest.com

Dated: September 20, 2018

DORSEY & WHITNEY LLP

By: /s Jaime Stilson

Stephen P. Lucke, #0154210

Paul Heiring, #0175808

Andrew Brantingham, #0389952

Jaime Stilson, #0392913

Nicholas J. Bullard, #0397400

Suite 1500, 50 South Sixth Street

Minneapolis, MN 55402-1498

Telephone: (612) 340-2600

Facsimile: (612) 340-2868

stoeri.bill@dorsey.com

lucke.steve@dorsey.com

heiring.paul@dorsey.com

brantingham.andrew@dorsey.com

stilson.jamie@dorsey.com

bullard.nick@dorsey.com

*Attorneys for Defendant Prime Therapeutics
LLC*

Dated: September 20, 2018

FELHABER LARSON

By: /s Jessica Nelson

Donald G. Heeman, #286023
Jessica J. Nelson, #347358
220 South Sixth Street, Suite
2200
Minneapolis, MN 55402-4504
Telephone: (612) 339-6321
Facsimile: (612) 338-0535
dheeman@felhaber.com
jnelson@felhaber.com

STEPTOE & JOHNSON LLP

Paul J. Ondrasik, Jr. (*pro hac
vice*)
Eric G. Serron, #169778
1330 Connecticut Avenue NW
Washington, DC 20036
Telephone: (202) 429-3000
pondrasik@steptoe.com
eserron@steptoe.com

QUINN EMANUEL URQUHART
& SULLIVAN, LLP

Michael Lyle (*pro hac vice*)
Jonathan Cooper (*pro hac vice*)
1300 I Street, NW, Suite 900
Washington, D.C. 20005
Telephone: (202) 538-8000
Facsimile: (202) 538-8100
mikelyle@quinnemanuel.com
jonathancooper@quinnemanuel.com

QUINN EMANUEL URQUHART
& SULLIVAN, LLP

Andrew S. Corkhill (*pro hac vice*)
51 Madison Avenue, 22nd Floor
New York, NY 10010
Telephone: (212) 849-7000
Facsimile: (212) 849-7100
andrewcorkhill@quinnemanuel.com

*Attorneys for Defendants Express Scripts Holding Co., Express Scripts, Inc.,
and Medco Health Solutions, Inc.*

Dated: September 20, 2018

FAEGRE BAKER DANIELS LLP

Steven L. Severson, #152857
Isaac B. Hall, #0395398
2200 Wells Fargo Center
90 South Seventh Street
Minneapolis, MN 55402
Telephone: (612) 766-7000
steven.severson@faegrebd.com
isaac.hall@faegrebd.com

WILLIAMS & CONNOLLY LLP

By: /s Daniel M. Dockery
Enu Mainigi (*pro hac vice*)
Paul Boehm (*pro hac vice*)
Daniel M. Dockery (*pro hac vice*)
725 Twelfth Street, N.W.
Washington, DC 20005
Telephone: (202) 434-5000
Facsimile: (202) 434-5029
emainigi@wc.com
pboehm@wc.com
ddockery@wc.com

*Attorneys for Defendants CVS Health Corp., Caremark, L.L.C.,
Caremark Rx, L.L.C., and CaremarkPCS Health, L.L.C.*

Dated: September 20, 2018

STINSON LEONARD STREET

Donald T. Campbell, #026217
Kadee J. Anderson, #0389902
50 South Sixth Street, Suite 2600
Minneapolis, MN 55402
Telephone: (612) 335-1500
donald.campbell@stinson.com
kadee.anderson@stinson.com

ALSTON & BIRD LLP

By: /s Elizabeth Broadway Brown
Brian D. Boone (*pro hac vice*)
Elizabeth Broadway Brown (*pro hac vice*)
Jordan E. Edwards (*pro hac vice*)
William H. Jordan (*pro hac vice*)
Emily C. McGowan (*pro hac vice*)
101 S. Tryon Street, Suite 4000
Charlotte, NC 28280
Telephone: (704) 444-1100
Facsimile: (704) 444-1111
brian.boone@alston.com
liz.brown@alston.com
jordan.edwards@alston.com
bill.jordan@alston.com
emily.mcgowan@alston.com

*Attorneys for Defendants Optum, Inc., OptumRX Holdings, LLC, OptumRx, Inc.,
United HealthCare Services, Inc. and UnitedHealth Group Inc.*